Dockets.Justia.com

1	Wł
2	dir So
3	Ins of
4	Th
5	De De
6	and
7	We und
8	
9	
10	
11	(Tł
12	inv
13	la.
14	
15	
16	
17	Be Be
18	Be
19	Be
20	1b
21	
22	
23	

24

25

26

27

28

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answers to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

Throughout this form, "Fujitsu" refers to Plaintiff Fujitsu Limited; "Belkin" refers to Defendants Belkin International, Inc. and Belkin, Inc.; "D-Link Corporation" refers to Defendant D-Link Corporation; "D-Link Systems" refers to Defendant D-Link Systems, Inc.; and "NETGEAR" refers to Defendant NETGEAR, Inc.

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

## <u>FUJITSU'S INDUCED INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS</u> AGAINST BELKIN, D-LINK SYSTEMS, D-LINK CORP., AND NETGEAR

(These questions should be answered regardless of your findings with respect to the validity or invalidity of the claims of the patent.)

1a. For each product below, has Fujitsu proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Belkin induced infringement of the claims below?

Please answer in each box with a "Y" for "yes" (for Fujitsu), or with an "N" for "no" (for Belkin).

Product	Claim 20	Claim 47	Claim 48
Belkin F5D7230 Router			
Belkin F5D8230 Router			
Belkin F5D6130 Router			
Belkin F5D8236 Router			

1b. For each product below, has Fujitsu proven by a preponderance of the evidence that D-Link Systems induced infringement of the claims below?

Please answer in each box with a "Y" for "yes" (for Fujitsu), or with an "N" for "no" (for D-Link Systems).

Product	Claim 20	Claim 47	Claim 48
D-Link DI-524 Router			
D-Link DWL-900AP+ Access Point			
D-Link DWL-1000AP Access Point			
D-Link DWL-2100AP Access Point			

Case No: 10-CV-03972-LHK

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

1c. For each product below, has Fujitsu proven by a preponderance of the evidence that D-Link Corporation induced infringement of the claims below?

Please answer in each box with a "Y" for "yes" (for Fujitsu), or with an "N" for "no" (for D-Link Corporation).

Product	Claim 20	Claim 47	Claim 48
D-Link DI-524 Router			
D-Link DWL-900AP+ Access Point			
D-Link DWL-1000AP Access Point			
D-Link DWL-2100AP Access Point			

1d. For each product below, has Fujitsu proven by a preponderance of the evidence that NETGEAR induced infringement of the claims below?

Please answer in each box with a "Y" for "yes" (for Fujitsu), or with an "N" for "no" (for NETGEAR).

Product	Claim 20	Claim 47	Claim 48
NETGEAR WGR614 Router			
NETGEAR WAB102 Access Point			
NETGEAR ME102 Access Point			
NETGEAR WNR834B Router			

Case No: 10-CV-03972-LHK

1		<b>DEFENDANTS' INVA</b>	LIDITY D	<u>EFENSES</u>	
2	(These question	s should be answered regardless o	of your findi	ngs with respect to inducement.)	
3		ANTICIP	ATION		
4		h claim below, have Defendants	_		
5	that the	claim is anticipated by a single	prior art re	eference?	
6	Claim 2	No (for Fujitsu)	Yes	(for Defendants)	
7	Claim 4	No (for Fujitsu)	Yes	(for Defendants)	
8	Claim 20	No (for Fujitsu)	Yes	(for Defendants)	
9 10	Claim 41	No (for Fujitsu)	Yes	(for Defendants)	
11	Claim 47	No (for Fujitsu)	Yes	(for Defendants)	
12	Claim 48	No (for Fujitsu)	Yes	(for Defendants)	
		ODVIOL	CNIECC		
13		OBVIOU	SINESS		
13 14	III	h claim below, have Defendants	proven by		
		h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious	proven by	clear and convincing evidence n of ordinary skill in the art as of	
14	that the	h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious	proven by to a persor		
14 15 16 17	that the April 30	h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious ), 1991?	proven by to a person  Yes	of ordinary skill in the art as of  (for Defendants)	•
14 15 16 17	that the April 30 Claim 2	h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious 1, 1991?  No (for Fujitsu)	proven by to a person  Yes	of ordinary skill in the art as of  (for Defendants)	•
14 15 16 17	that the April 30  Claim 2  Claim 4	h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious 0, 1991?  No (for Fujitsu)  No (for Fujitsu)	yes Yes	of ordinary skill in the art as of  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)	3
114 115 116 117 118 119 220	that the April 30  Claim 2  Claim 4  Claim 20	h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious 0, 1991?  No (for Fujitsu)  No (for Fujitsu)  No (for Fujitsu)	yes Yes Yes	of ordinary skill in the art as of  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that the April 30  Claim 2  Claim 4  Claim 20  Claim 41	h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious 0, 1991?  No (for Fujitsu)  No (for Fujitsu)  No (for Fujitsu)  No (for Fujitsu)	yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	of ordinary skill in the art as of  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)	
114 115 116 117 118 119 220 221	that the April 30  Claim 2  Claim 4  Claim 20  Claim 41  Claim 47	h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious 0, 1991?  No (for Fujitsu)  No (for Fujitsu)	yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	of ordinary skill in the art as of  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)	
114 115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222 223	that the April 30  Claim 2  Claim 4  Claim 20  Claim 41  Claim 47	h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious 0, 1991?  No (for Fujitsu)  No (for Fujitsu)	yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	of ordinary skill in the art as of  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)	
14 15 16 17 18	that the April 30  Claim 2  Claim 4  Claim 20  Claim 41  Claim 47	h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious 0, 1991?  No (for Fujitsu)  No (for Fujitsu)	yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	of ordinary skill in the art as of  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)	
114 115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222 223 224	that the April 30  Claim 2  Claim 4  Claim 20  Claim 41  Claim 47	h claim below, have Defendants claim would have been obvious 0, 1991?  No (for Fujitsu)  No (for Fujitsu)	yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	of ordinary skill in the art as of  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)  (for Defendants)	

Case No: 10-CV-03972-LHK

VERDICT FORM

27

28

1		DAMAGES T	O FUJITSU (IF APPLI	CABLE)
2				
3	3.	What is the total dollar amou infringement of the asserted		d to receive from Belkin for its
4		_		
5		\$		·
6	3a.	For the total dollar amount in breakdown for direct infring		
7				
8	- 44	Product	Royalty Rate	Damages Amount
8		F5D7010 Card		
9		F5D8010 Card		
10	l <b></b>	F5D6020 Card		
	Belkin	F5D9013 Kit		
11	3b.	For the total dollar amount in	n vour answer to Questi	on 3 please provide the
12	30.	breakdown for induced infrii		
13			· · ·	
13		Product	Royalty Rate	Damages Amount
14	Belkin	F5D7230 Router		
		F5D7230 Router F5D8230 Router		-
14 15	Belkin			
	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router		
15	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router F5D6130 Router		
15 16	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router F5D6130 Router		
15 16 17 18	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router F5D6130 Router		
15 16 17 18 19	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router F5D6130 Router		
15 16 17 18 19 20	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router F5D6130 Router		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router F5D6130 Router		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router F5D6130 Router		
15 16 17	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router F5D6130 Router		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router F5D6130 Router		
15   16   17   18   19   20   21   22   23   24	Belkin Belkin	F5D8230 Router F5D6130 Router		

Case No: 10-CV-03972-LHK

VERDICT FORM

28

4.	XX714 41- 4-4-1 3 - 31		
т.		•	ed to receive from D-Linl
	Systems for its infringement of	f the asserted claims o	f the patent?
	\$		·
4a.	For the total dollar amount in		
	breakdown for direct infringe	ment by product below	w.
	Product	Royalty Rate	Damages Amount
D-Lir	nk DWL-G630 Card		
D-Lir	nk DWL-650+ Card		
D-Lir	nk DWL-650 Card		
D-Lir	nk DWL-923 Kit		
	For the total dollar amount in breakdown for induced infring		
D <sub>-</sub> I ir	nk DI-524 Router	Royalty Rate	Damages Amount
	nk DWL-900AP+ Access Point		
	nk DWL-1000AP Access Point		
D-Lir	nk DWL-2100AP Access Point		

Case No: 10-CV-03972-LHK

	\$		·
			on 5, please provide the
breakdo	own for direct infringe	ement by product below	<b>7.</b>
P	Product	Royalty Rate	Damages Amount
D-Link DWL-C	G630 Card		
D-Link DWL-6	550+ Card		
D-Link DWL-6	550 Card		
D-Link DWL-9	23 Kit		
	own for induced infrir Product	Royalty Rate	ow.  Damages Amount
D-Link DI-524	Router	v	
D-Link DWL-9	000AP+ Access Point		
D-Link DWL-1	000AP Access Point		
D-Link DWL-2	2100AP Access Point		

Case No: 10-CV-03972-LHK VERDICT FORM

6. What is the total dollar amount its infringement of the asserted		to receive from NETGE
6a. For the total dollar amount in breakdown for direct infringe		6, please provide the
Product	Royalty Rate	Damages Amoun
NETGEAR WG511 Card		
NETGEAR WAB501 Card		
NETGEAR MA401 Card		
NETGEAR WGB511 Kit		
6b. For the total dollar amount in breakdown for induced infrin	gement by product below	
Product	Royalty Rate	Damages Amour
NETGEAR WGR614 Router		
NETGEAR WAB102 Access Point		
NETGEAR ME102 Access Point		_
NETGEAR WNR834B Router		
Case No: 10-CV-03972-LHK		

## United States District Court For the Northern District of California

## <u>FUJITSU'S WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS</u> AGAINST BELKIN, D-LINK SYSTEMS, D-LINK CORPORATION, AND NETGEAR

(This	question should be answered if you find any of the claims of the patent to be valid.)
7.	Has Fujitsu proven by clear and convincing evidence that Belkin's infringement of the patent was willful?
	Yes (for Fujitsu) No (for Belkin)
8.	Has Fujitsu proven by clear and convincing evidence that D-Link Systems's infringement of the patent was willful?
	Yes (for Fujitsu) No (for D-Link Systems)
9.	Has Fujitsu proven by clear and convincing evidence that D-Link Corporation's infringement of the patent was willful?
	Yes (for Fujitsu) No (for D-Link Corporation)
10.	Has Fujitsu proven by clear and convincing evidence that NETGEAR's infringement of the patent was willful?
	Yes (for Fujitsu) No (for NETGEAR)
reflect form i Forep	have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately ts your unanimous determinations. The Jury Foreperson should then sign and date the verdict in the spaces below and notify the Bailiff that you have reached a verdict. The Jury erson should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back ne courtroom.
DAT	TED:, 2012 By: Jury Foreperson

Case No: 10-CV-03972-LHK